



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,893	09/19/2000	John Michael Everson	30604	5121
7590	12/15/2004		EXAMINER	
STEVEN J. FUNK SPRINT LAW DEPARTMENT 6391 Sprint Parkway Overland Park, KS 66251			PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2136	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/664,893	EVERSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Pramila Parthasarathy	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2004.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the application filed on 09/24/2004 for request for continued examination. Claims 1 – 20 were received for consideration. Claims 1 – 12 were previously presented and Claims 13 – 20 are new added claims. Claims 1 – 20 are currently being considered.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed September 24, 2004 have been fully considered. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1 – 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1 – 4, 7 –10, 13, 14 and 16 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alegre et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,199,113).

Regarding Claim 1, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), the method comprising the steps of:

storing security information for a plurality of computer users in a user profile database (Column 4 lines 8 – 36);

receiving at an authorization server coupled with the user profile database log-in information from the computer user who has launched a computer application (Column 4 lines 8 – 40);

in response to step b, creating a Session ID for the computer user with the authorization server (Column 4 lines 8 – 40 and Column 6 lines 24 – 42);

storing at least a portion of the Session ID on the user's computer (Column 4 lines 8 – 42);

also in response to step b, creating an object associated with the computer user or the Session ID (Column 4 lines 8 – 42 and Column 5 lines 8 – 20);

storing the object dynamically in a directory coupled with the authorization server (Column 6 lines 24 – 34);

copying at least some of the security information relating to the computer user from the user profile database to the object in the directory (Column 6 lines 24 – 67);

comparing the log-in information entered by the computer user to the security information for the computer user and allowing the computer user access to the launched computer application if the user is an authenticated or authorized user of the computer application (Column 6 lines 24 – 49); and

permitting other computer applications launched by the computer user to reference the Session ID on the user's computer so that the other computer applications may access the object for the computer user on the directory to authenticate or authorize the user for the other computer applications without requiring the user to re-enter the log-in information (Column 6 lines 6 – 42).

Regarding Claim 7, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), the system comprising:

a user profile database for storing security information for a plurality of computer users (Column 4 lines 8 – 36);

an authorization server coupled with the user profile database for receiving log-in information from a computer user who has launched a computer application, for creating a Session ID for the computer user, for storing at least a portion of the Session ID on the user's computer and for creating an object associated with the computer user or the Session ID (Column 4 lines 8 – 42; Column 5 lines 8 – 20 and Column 6 lines 24 – 42); and

a directory coupled with the authorization server for dynamically storing the object created by the authorization server (Column 6 lines 24 – 34),

the authorization server being further operable for copying at least some of the security information relating to the computer user from the user profile database to the object in the directory, comparing log information entered by the computer user to the security information for the computer user and allowing the computer user access to the launched computer application if the user is an authenticated or authorized user of the computer application, permitting other computer applications launched by the computer user to reference the Session ID on the user's computer so that the other computer applications may access the object for the computer user on the directory to authenticate or authorize the user for the other computer applications without requiring the user to re-enter the log-in information (Column 6 lines 6 – 67).

Regarding Claim 13, Alegre teaches and describes a method of utilizing an authorization server for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a log-in from the computer user (Fig. 4 Column 5 lines 21 – 36);

creating a unique session ID for the user after log-in (Column 4 lines 8 – 40 and Column 6 lines 24 – 42);

storing data representative of at least a portion of the session ID on the user's computer (Column 4 lines 8 – 42);

creating an object corresponding to the unique session ID and storing the object on the authorization server (Column 4 lines 8 – 42 and Column 5 lines 8 – 20);  
allowing a first application executed by the user to authenticate the user, wherein the first application authenticates the user by accessing the data representative of at least a portion of the session ID stored on the user computer and providing the data representative of at least a portion of the session ID to the authorization server (Column 6 lines 24 – 49); and  
allowing the first application executed by the user to modify the object after the user is authenticated (Column 7 lines 3 – Column 8 line 21).

Claims 2 and 8 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 1 and 7. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), the security information including authentication and authorization information (Column 4 lines 48 – 67 and Column 7 lines 55 – Column 8 line 20).

Claims 4 and 10 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 1 and 7. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary

and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), the Session ID being based on at least one of the following: a date on which the computer user launched the computer application; a time in which the computer user launched the computer application; a TCP/IP address of the computer user; and a user name of the computer user (Column 5 line 8 – Column 6 line 65).

Claim 14 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 13. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method of utilizing an authorization server for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), wherein the first application modifies the object by accessing the data representative of at least a portion of the session ID stored on the user computer and providing the data representative of at least a portion of the session ID to the authorization server (Column 6 lines 24 – 49 and Column 7 line 3 – Column 8 line 21).

Claim 16 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 13. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method of utilizing an authorization server for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), further including the step of allowing a second application to authenticate the user, wherein the second application authenticates the user by accessing the data representative of at least a portion of the session ID stored on the user computer and providing the data representative of at least

a portion of the session ID to the authorization server (Column 7 line 20 – Column 8 line 21).

Claim 20 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 13. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method of utilizing an authorization server for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), further including the step of allowing the user to modify the object by utilizing the first application (Column 7 lines 3 – 32).

Claims 3 and 9 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 2 and 8. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), the authentication and authorization information including at least one of the following: user names, user IDs, passwords, public-key data, certificates, and access control information (Column 5 line 8 – Column 6 line 65).

Claim 17 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 16. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method of utilizing an authorization server for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), further including the step of

allowing the second application executed by the user to modify the object after the user is authenticated, wherein the second application modifies the object by accessing the data representative of at least a portion of the session ID stored on the user computer and providing the data representative of at least a portion of the session ID to the authorization server (Column 6 lines 24 – 49 and Column 7 line 3 – Column 8 line 21).

Claim 18 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 16. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method of utilizing an authorization server for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), further including the step of allowing the second application to access the object such that the second application is operable to utilize the modifications generated by the first application (Column 6 lines 24 – 49 and Column 7 line 3 – Column 8 line 21).

Claim 19 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 16. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method of utilizing an authorization server for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), wherein the first application is executed utilizing a first third-party server and the second application is executed utilizing a second third-party Server (Column 7 line 20 – Column 8 line 44).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5, 6, 11, 12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alegre et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,199,113, hereinafter "Alegre") in view of Hartman et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,960,411 hereinafter "Hartman").

Claims 5 and 11 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 1 and 7. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), further including the steps of creating a shopping cart and storing the shopping cart along with the object in the directory (Alegre Column 8 lines 28 – 44). Alegre does not explicitly disclose that the method for dynamically tracking a user session includes the steps of creating a shopping cart and storing the shopping cart along with the object in the directory. However, Hartman discloses a method for creating a shopping cart and storing the shopping cart along with a unique client identifier (cookie), purchaser-specific information (Hartman Column 3 line 31 – Column 6 line 21). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hartman's shopping cart system into the dynamically tracking user session system of Alegre.

Alegre could have been modified by Hartman to arrive the claimed invention by having the shopping cart with user purchase information to be saved on the directory as taught by Hartman (See Hartman Column 3 line 31 – Column 8 line 25) and as suggested by Alegre (See Alegre Column 7 line 3 – Column 8 line 53). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Alegre by Hartman as discussed above because in a shopping cart systems user profiles are stored in a directory as taught by Hartman and employing the shopping cart within Alegre would provide an efficient and secure method for dynamically tracking a user session.

Claims 6 and 12 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 5 and 11. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 – 13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44), further including the steps of allowing the user to select items to be purchased and storing information relating to the selected items in the shopping cart (Hartman Column 3 line 46 – Column 4 line 26; Column 5 line 27 – Column 6 line 21 and Column 7 line 57 – Column 8 line 25).

Claim 15 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 13. Furthermore, Alegre teaches and describes a method of utilizing an authorization server for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Fig 2 –

13; Summary and Column 4 line 8 – Column 8 line 44). Alegre does not explicitly disclose that modifying the object to reflect items selected by the user for purchase. However, Harman discloses a method for creating a shopping cart and storing the shopping cart, wherein modifying the object to reflect items selected by the user for purchase. (Hartman Column 3 line 46 – Column 4 line 26; Column 5 line 27 – Column 6 line 21 and Column 7 line 57 – Column 8 line 25). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hartman's shopping cart system into the dynamically tracking user session system of Alegre.

Alegre could have been modified by Hartman to arrive the claimed invention by having the shopping cart with user purchase information to be saved on the directory and modifying the object to reflect the user purchase as taught by Hartman (See Hartman Column 3 line 31 – Column 8 line 25) and as suggested by Alegre (See Alegre Column 7 line 3 – Column 8 line 53). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Alegre by Hartman as discussed above because in a shopping cart systems user profiles are stored in a directory as taught by Hartman and employing the shopping cart within Alegre would provide an efficient and secure method for dynamically tracking a user session.

***Conclusion***

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 571-272-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. To 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-232-3795.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900 and the general central fax number is 703 – 872 – 9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pramila Parthasarathy  
December 06, 2004.

*PL*  
AV2131  
12/10/04